

- 1) The following are replies to posted comments in re: ET Docket 03-104.
- 2) I have been active as a communications hobbyist for roughly 20 years, and have dealt on numerous occasions with RF interference to communications in HF and VHF spectrum.
- 3) I have been licensed as a radio amateur for roughly six years, and in that time have dealt with power line based RF interference in the portions of RF spectrum allocated to the Amateur service. As a General-class operator whose primary interest in upgrading is the use of HF spectrum, I have personal interest in this docket.
- 4) Replies to Comments shall be cited by filing body.
- 5) Cinergy Corporation
  - a. This comment in no way addresses the technical concerns regarding interference with licensed users of HF and VHF spectrum expressed by many comments and the American Radio Relay League's extensively documented research, and indeed is noteworthy in studiously avoiding any mention of these concerns.
- 6) PPL Telecom, LLC
  - a. In Section V of this comment, the company states that they do not believe that BPL poses any significant threat of interference to consumer devices or other users of RF spectrum.
  - b. Absolutely no research is cited to support this claim.
- 7) Current Technologies

- a. On page two of this comment, the claim is made that “the entire power line does not act like an antenna”. This claim is ludicrous, as generations of amateur operators have used quite literally anything made of metal to experiment with transmission of RF energy. Bed frames, chain link fences, and telephone lines that are no longer in use are only a few examples of objects that have been used as antennas by amateurs over the years. Telephone lines bear a great semblance to power lines.
- b. Here also is seen the repeated claim that BPL will pose no threat of interference to licensed users of RF spectrum. Concerns of other users of spectrum are cavalierly dismissed, without showing of research that might contradict the ARRL’s opinion.

8) Power Line Communications Association

- a. On Page Two of this comment, the assertion is made that “The Commission must discount speculative and self-serving comments...” This strikes us as yet another BPL advocate evading responding to the American Radio Relay League’s research by launching attacks on the motives of those who oppose less stringent regulation to this new form of Internet access.

9) The comments of BPL advocates continue in the general vein of dismissing interference concerns of other users of RF spectrum with no empirical research to support dismissal of the American Radio Relay League’s findings.

10) Given the nature of BPL advocates’ comments, I am still of the view that the ARRL research is valid and that BPL poses a very serious threat of RF

interference to existing users of HF and VHF spectrum. I therefore respectfully request that the Commission maintain current Part 15 standards in regard to the new BPL technology